

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner states that the inventions are distinct, because Groups I and II are related to distinct methods. However, it can be seen that the methods of Groups I and II are not distinct methods, but are related in that the method of Group I uses a sheet former at a relative humidity of 40% or more and the method of Group II passes an anti-static agent and at least one of a first fibrous material and second fibrous material through a sheet former. Both groups may employ an anti-static agent, which in both instances may be water. Therefore, it can be seen that the methods of Groups I and II are not distinct, but are related to one another. In view of the above arguments, it is requested that the claims of Groups I and II be rejoined and examined in the present application.

Further, if the claims of Group II are ultimately found allowable, it is requested that the claims of Group I be rejoined, based on the Examiner's statement on page 3, lines 1-3 of the Restriction Requirement.

Further, if a search of the prior art uncovers no art over which the elected species is rejectable, it is requested that the Examiner extend the search to the non-elected species.

Accordingly, for the reasons presented above, it is submitted that the Patent and Trademark Office has failed to meet the burden necessary to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Roland E. Martin
Registration No. 48,082